European Review, Vol. 9, No. 2, 201–212 (2001) © Academia Europaea, Printed in the United Kingdom

How can one make labour history interesting again?

JÜRGEN KOCKA

Friedrich Meinecke Institut, Freie Universität Berlin, Koserstr 20, 14195 Berlin, Germany. E-mail: prokocka@zedat.fu-berlin.de

First, this paper sketches the development of labour history as a historical subdiscipline up to the 1970s and 1980s when it became a booming field, an area of great excitement and high productivity. Why this should have been the case is an interesting question to ask in hindsight. Secondly, I discuss certain trends in the last 10–15 years that are related to a decline in this field, not in terms of sophistication, but certainly with regard to the field's popularity among historians, students and the public. Dealing with this rather dramatic change might tell us something about the way my discipline – modern history with a stress on social history – works, where it gets its vitality from, its conjunctures and fashions. Thirdly, I present some personal ideas about how one could, and perhaps should, deal with the present situation, its problems and its opportunities. I am presently working on the third volume of a history of labour in 19th century Germany – a project to which I have returned after many years.[1] Some of the general problems I have encountered in this project will also be dealt with, indirectly, in this paper.

1. Introduction

'Labour history', Marcel van der Linden writes, 'has a double meaning. In a narrow sense it denotes the history of social movements of wage earners, including their leaders, their organisations (e.g. mutual aid societies, trade unions, consumer, and producer co-operatives, and working-class parties), and their collective actions (petitions, strikes, boycotts, electoral campaigns, etc.). In a broad sense, "labour history" comprises the history of the working classes at large, including the history of family life, demography, everyday culture, leisure activities, housing, religion, migration, and so on.'[2] While labour history in the narrow sense is not very challenging for the present purpose (although it still exists), variants of labour history in the broader sense are the object of the following reflections. I will concentrate on labour history in the 19th and early 20th centuries. It will be a survey emphasizing historiographical developments in Germany, but they are not untypical for what has happened in Western Europe and North America. Developments there will also be touched upon.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2. The rise of labour history

Up to the 1950s, labour and working class history was not a field of particular academic prominence. Important, even excellent work was nevertheless produced, by the Webbs and the Hammonds in England, by Selig Perlman and John Commons in the United States, and in Germany by intellectuals and practitioners who had frequently been close to the labour movement themselves (Gustav Mayer for example). Some of these works are still cited today. What most of them had in common was an emphasis on the labour organizations, labour politics and labour ideologies and sometimes on the biographies of labour leaders. If context was taken into account, it was a broad look at either the political system or the economy, stressing wages, poverty, alienation and perhaps capitalism in general. Most of these works were inspired by the ideological and moral position of the authors and their sympathy for the workers and their movements, even when they were criticizing them for not being radical, or revolutionary enough. In the communist countries, a party-centred strand of labour history started to emerge with explicit and implicit political functions of legitimisation.[3]

The situation changed drastically in the 1960s and 1970s. Seminal articles, for example by Eric Hobsbawm in England or Werner Conze in Germany, had already appeared earlier, paving the way for this change.[4] With the rise of comprehensive notions of social history, labour history was extensively broadened and integrated into the mainstream of historical research. The histories of labour organizations and politics, of unions and parties, of strikes and collective bargaining did not become obsolete, on the contrary they continued to flourish. Nevertheless, historians increasingly felt that, in order truly to understand the history of labour organisations and politics, it was necessary also to look at the situation, the lives and the aspirations of the people who were part of these labour organizations. Other parts of social history and neighbouring disciplines played an influential role and, step by step, researchers moved into new and exciting fields.[5]

The workplace became a major area for study. Workers at work, in different work environments ranging from the artisans' shop through construction and building to large-scale factory production were studied, while rural workers and white-collar workers remained largely neglected. These studies helped to differentiate between different types of workers who had previously often been depicted as a fairly homogeneous mass. Different skills and problems of dequalification, autonomy at work (and its alleged reduction or loss in the course of industrialization) turned out to be favourite topics through which historians hoped to relate changes in the workplace and changing work experiences, to the inclination to protest or participate in collective action within the labour movement. David Montgomery did the most important research on this subject in the US.[6] The importance of the role of artisans in early labour movements has been revealed in England, France and Germany.

For a while, social mobility patterns of 19th and early 20th century cities and towns became favourite fields of study. Stephen Thernstrom's *Poverty and Progress* appeared in 1964, and it triggered a wave of social historical studies that exploited new types of data (census documents, marriage registers, address books etc), and used computer-based quantitative methods. These studies tended to be critical of the traditional rags to riches myth. They showed that at least four out of five 19th century workers would remain in the working class all their lives and hand their working-class status down to their sons and daughters – an important

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ingredient of working class formation and stability over the generations. Differentiation by ethnicity was studied as well. The relation between vertical social mobility and geographic migration turned out to be central. The emphasis was more on structure, processes and figures and less on action, experiences and meaning. Labour politics and organizations moved to the periphery.[7]

The history of working class families became another major field of study. The relations between work, family, and collective mentalities were intensively debated, particularly with respect to the cottage workers. The study of family-based socialization and education seemed to open up new avenues for the study of working-class consciousness or working class culture as it began to be labelled in the 1970s. Housing and other accommodation arrangements were extensively researched. With regard to working-class households, income and changing relations between sexes and generations became the object of study. Changing consumption patterns could be traced and related to the question of whether a specific working-class culture emerged and, if so, when and how this may have helped to generate class specific solidarity and resources of collective action within or outside the labour movement. Several scholars have contributed to this field in various ways, E. P. Thompson and Peter Laslett, Michelle Perrot in France and, in Germany, a group of Göttingen historians, who have studied problems of proto-industrialization. Most of these were not primarily labour historians. Indeed, labour history has advanced by amalgamating with newly emerging fields that cover topics outside labour history.[8]

An illustration of this process of advancement by amalgamation can also be seen in the field of the history of social protest, in the 1970s and 1980s. *The Rebellious Century* by Charles, Louise and Richard Tilly appeared in 1975. Historians of social protest accumulated data from newspapers and other sources on the violent or illegal actions of different collectivities. They analysed them, often using statistical methods, and used the results to draw conclusions on the conditions and consequences of social protest as well as about the aspirations, the collective behaviour and the conflict inclinations of those involved, that is the workers, their protests and strikes. Concepts such as 'social protest' and 'social movements' were imported from neighbouring social sciences and redefined for purposes of historical research. Labour history was related to social-scientific studies: it was a field in which new approaches could be explored, savoured and, if found failing, discarded.[9]

Finally, I want to mention the move towards *Alltagsgeschichte*, toward the history of perceptions, experiences and culture that occurred from the early 1980s on. It has been a major, some people believe, even a paradigmatic shift in attitudes. While structures and processes (i.e. conditions and consequences of human action) were at the centre of social history in the 1960s and 1970s, now historians discovered (or rediscovered) a fascination with the 'internal side of history'. They became interested in subjective factors such as changing perceptions and interpretations in the minds of people in the past, cultural practices and experiences, forms of communication, language, production of meaning, the symbolic aspects of people's lives and cultures. Historians have discussed these changes extensively and they still continue to do so. This is a process with many aspects, which is far from complete. Here, I want to emphasize one point, in particular. In the 1980s, it was, first of all, in labour history, besides gender history and ethnic history that this paradigmatic change was attempted, practised and disputed. The everyday life of workers was studied, frequently in micro-historical contexts:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press

their leisure activities, sexuality, and language. Interest in gender increased. Seminal studies by Karin Hausen had a strong impact. The culture of workers was looked at in a fresh way. Now, workers' protests were less often analysed as mass phenomena by statistical means, but single riots, crowd actions or journeymen strikes were reconstructed using their language and symbols to elucidate the underlying motives and meaning. Thompson's book proved to be tremendously influential. Again, historians borrowed from neighbouring disciplines, for example from Clifford Geertz and his notion of 'thick description', later on from Pierre Bourdieu and his notion of 'habitus'. The conflicts between structuralists and culturalists, between social and cultural historians, between analytical and hermeneutic approaches were engaging and entertaining, and they occurred at least partly – and this is my point – in the field of labour history that itself changed under the impact of these clashes and innovations.[10]

For labour historians, this was a period of excitement and outstanding popularity. Seminars on such topics were much in demand; this was the field in which the brightest graduate students wanted to write their dissertations. Research money was available and books on working class topics, on labour, socialism, social inequality, and social policy problems were plentiful and frequently reviewed in non-specialized journals appealing to the educated public at large.[11] Why?

Labour history seemed to respond to a basic demand for revisionism. This was a time – the 1960s and 1970s – when criticism of traditional structures ran high in our societies, when change seemed necessary and feasible, when reforms were advocated in many spheres of life, frequently from democratic, liberal, social democratic or socialist points of view. Frequently, interest in labour history was related to the belief that labour, socialism, or at least social democratic reform were still to play a major role in the future. This was the time in the West when different forms of Marxism were given a new lease of life. Even those of us who did not share such political and intellectual commitment felt that the accepted paradigms of historical research had largely neglected the darker sides of history: the inequality and discrimination, the silent majorities, the underprivileged, the underdogs. This was the mood which, in one way or another, helped to make labour history popular.

I should mention the East–West conflict in those decades of the Cold War. Labour history was, of course, central to the orthodox Marxist interpretations of history that dominated in an inescapable, indisputable way in the communist countries. The impact on labour history in those countries was rather mixed: much work was done in the field, but often in a sterile way unlikely to attract methodological imagination and dissenting minds. However, for historians in the West, the political instrumentalization of labour history in the East created an additional stimulus. On the one hand it made the topic difficult and heavy going with a lot of infertile rhetoric, when historians from the East and the West met at international conferences. However, on the other hand, it also made the subject more controversial, more relevant, and at times exceptionally exciting – particularly in divided Germany.[12]

Labour history was favoured by paradigmatic and methodological changes within the profession as well. The 1960s and the 1970s saw the rise and the expansion of social history. The quest for expanding social history had numerous meanings and, in addition, there were national differences. Speaking from a German perspective, it was felt that historians had traditionally over-stressed the role of events, decisions and single actors. In order to correct this one-sidedness, the history of structures and processes, later on of mentalities and cultures,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press

should be firmly included. Moreover, it was felt that, traditionally, politics had been the centrepiece of general history, at the cost of social and economic phenomena, which badly needed to be rediscovered and strengthened in the study of history. In addition, it was held that historians had traditionally been fascinated by strictly hermeneutic methods, by narrative approaches and by language as near to the sources as possible. In contrast, many social historians advocated cooperation with the neighbouring social science disciplines, particularly sociology, economics and political science. They tried to apply systematic concepts, such as class, industrialization and social protest, and also emphasized the use of analytical approaches and methods appropriate to the study of collective behaviour and large populations. Labour history offered many opportunities to apply all these aspects.[13]

3. The decline of labour history

Over the last 15 years or so, things have changed, due to influences outside the profession and due to the internal dynamics of the profession. Labour history does not belong to the winners. A few remarks on this must suffice at the risk of superficiality.

The mixture of radical criticism and hope for modernizing reforms, so typical in some Western countries in the 1960s and 1970s, is largely gone. Nowadays, people believe less in the advantages of modernization and emancipation than 25 years ago. Traditional reform strategies seem to have little to offer with respect to the solution of present problems, such as the environment or the resurgence of nationalism and war. The breakdown of dictatorial communism in 1989–90 was a liberating turning point. However, in the West, it also reinforced existing doubts about basic socialist beliefs. The decline of Marxism had been underway well before 1989/90. But its decline was accelerated and codified by 1989/90.

The labour movement seems to have weakened almost everywhere in the West over the last quarter of a century. Ralph Dahrendorf, the liberal sociologist, already spoke about the 'end of the social-democratic century', in the mid-1980s. In contrast to the 1960s and 1970s, people do not expect much with respect to their problems, from labour, social democracy, socialism, or the working class in general. Other social movements have now captured the imagination and hopes of committed intellectuals and students, for example feminism, the green movement and, most recently, protests against certain aspects of globalization. Even the global expansion of capitalism and its victory in nearly all spheres of life has not revitalized an interest in the labour movement. Its decline and the devolution of the working class are characteristic elements of modern societies. One of the consequences, certainly not the most serious, seems to be a decline of interest in labour history. Nowadays, this is no longer the field that the brightest young students clamour to enter. They prefer seminars on gender history, on the culture of the bourgeoisie or elites, the symbolic dimensions of everyday life, the history of gestures and body. In Eastern Europe, although the motives are slightly different, the results are similar. After the study of labour history in its Marxist–Leninist form had ceased to be obligatory, scholars and students turned away from the topic altogether. It reminded them of party rule and ideological pressure and they were glad to get away from all that.

I have already mentioned the decline of Marxism. In general, socio-economic interpretations of social, political, and cultural life have lost much of their popularity. However, the notions of labour, of work and of the working class are primarily defined in terms of the socio-economic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press

space. Even in its non-Marxist forms and even from cultural historical viewpoints, labour history remains closely related to socio-economic interpretations of history. The less one believes in them, the less one feels inclined to structure one's reality charts with the help of concepts such as class, occupation, workplace or social inequality. Other structuring concepts and analytical dimensions become more important, such as culture, gender or power. They can apply to the history of labour, but they can be applied to other problem areas as well, sometimes even more effectively.

The developments I have sketched have led to a high degree of fragmentation within the field of labour history. For some, fragmentation – under the label of 'de-centred' approaches – is an explicit aim. In this way they hope to achieve, as Hans Medick put it, a 'greater awareness of the uniqueness, difference, and otherness of historical phenomena, something which is rather obscured by universalising, passepartout categories', such as industrialization, social protest or class.[14] Those who still think that coherence is desirable and synthesis possible, frequently lack organizing schemes and structuring concepts that can bind together phenomena as different as the politics of socialist parties, popular festivals and the physical experiences of specific types of workers.

In a way, the field is not in crisis, it is empirically rich and excellent monographs continue to be written. It is still no problem to fill the five to ten journals worldwide that specialize in working class and labour history. In fact, one might argue that the present situation of undefined openness offers particular opportunities for experimentation and, perhaps, creativity.

However, as a senior practitioner of the field, Ira Katznelson, from Columbia University in New York said: the elan has disappeared, the 'cause' has been lost, the intellectual purpose is gone, directionality is lacking, engaged history has moved elsewhere. 'Labour history risks becoming an elegy of dashed hopes.'[15] Old paradigms are questioned but new ones have not yet emerged; there is overspecialization and much fragmentation. Interest in the field has dramatically declined and some challenge its *raison d'être*. If classes can devolute, and certainly they can, working class history and labour history can devolute and disintegrate too.

4. What should be done?

Maybe we should see this as a process of normalization: the history of labour as one of many topics, neither particularly exciting nor particularly controversial. With the decline of its political importance, labour history experienced a process of emancipation. Labour historians have freed themselves from scholastic disputes about the so-called 'false consciousness' of non-radical workers, from over-estimating Marx, and from stifling considerations of 'political correctness'. Let us enjoy our declining importance and the freedom that accompanies this decline. The field is less structured than ever, it is a good time for asking new questions.

New questions have clearly been asked. The 1990s were not just a period of decline, but a period of innovation, as well. Under the impact of the 'linguistic turn' in history and the humanities, the 'language of labour' became a major field of research. As a consequence, historians learned to understand that most of the phenomena they studied were partly 'constructed', 'invented', 'imagined', i.e. framed or at least deeply influenced by the discourses of the contemporaries, by their cognitive and semantic strategies. Such a reinterpretation of the stuff of which history is made can easily go too far, by taking an idealistic, voluntaristic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or relativistic twist. On the other hand, some of this work has had an eye-opening effect. It has sometimes helped to get us nearer to truth. It has brought politics back into labour history where it had been driven out. It has certainly sparked heated and controversial debate in a field that otherwise seemed doomed to become quite boring.[16]

While interest in class has decreased more than it should have, much research has been done on gender and ethnicity. These are the areas in which much progress has been made. While it is true that these currently fashionable fields have partially marginalized labour history, they have also enriched it considerably.[17]

In German historical research, the thorough investigation of the modern 'Bürgertum' (the concept oscillates between 'middle class' and 'bourgeoisie', it also resonates with 'citizen') has been one of the major achievements of the last 15 years. After the end of the East–West confrontation, which had quite an influence on intellectual life in Germany and certainly affected labour history, it has become easier to take a fresh look at the relationship between worker and 'Bürger', labour and 'bürgerliche Gesellschaft'. This may well change traditional views and challenge emerging new orthodoxies, influenced by gender, cultural and post-modern approaches.[18] Many new questions have been asked and many more remain. I will conclude with three suggestions.

First, labour history could make the most of its newly acquired distance to place its problems into a wider time frame, something that has rarely been done before. Often, the research topics of historians, including labour historians, are rather narrowly defined, time-specific and limited to clearly defined periods. Maybe now is the time to enlarge them. On the one hand, this would mean intensifying exchanges with our colleagues in Early Modern History, a process that is well on the way. On the other hand, we should start out from the present situation and accept that the 'good decades', the 'long historical moment' of the labour movements is a thing of the past. This might provide new opportunities to historicize labour in a more fundamental way.

I will make just a few remarks concerning exchanges with Early Modern History. Most historians of 19th and 20th century labour have tended to consider their topic as being about something relatively new: labour as a product of industrial capitalism or capitalist industrialization, class movements, or popular movements, with a culture striving for incessant improvement, progressive reforms, if not revolution, has seemed far removed from the rural and urban lower class rebellions, protests and movements of the preceding pre-revolutionary centuries. However, recent research seems to point in another direction. Detailed studies of 17th and 18th century journeymen strikes and crowd actions have shown that many of them were not just reactive, but striving for improvements, although often with a tradition-oriented rhetoric. On the other hand it has, in the last decade, become easier to concentrate on the conservative and defensive aspects of working class populations, popular protest and even labour movement strategies in the 19th century. So, how deep has the caesura of the late 18th/early 19th century really been, with respect to the lower classes and their mentalities as well as to their ability to act and to influence history?[19]

As to looking back at 19th and 20th century labour from a 21st century viewpoint, let me be equally brief and refer only to the German situation. Basically, I regard the Social Democratic labour movement between its foundation in 1848 and, let us say, its defeat in 1933 (maybe even later) as an amazingly *progressive* phenomenon. It did not only fight for the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interests of its membership, it simultaneously worked for what I would call social and political progress in a more general sense. Labour was clearly in the camp of those who supported and claimed civil rights and civil liberties for individuals and groups. Social Democrats demanded further parliamentarization of a political system that was pre-parliamentary and authoritarian in many ways. They fought for the democratization of the system, especially of the electoral law which, in most of Germany, retained strong elements of a *régime censitaire* until 1919. Social Democrats demanded the expansion of freely accessible institutions of education and law, and they demanded measures to reduce poverty and increase equality of opportunities. All this, I believe, in the general interest of their society and not just (but also) in the special interests of their clientele. With respect to extreme nationalism and anti-Semitism, the Social Democratic record is not spotless but it is better than the records of most other social and political groups in Imperial Germany. Social Democrats had their shortcomings with regard to the incorporation and equal treatment of women, but even by this yardstick they did better than most others. And while the split between Social Democracy and Communism after 1917 made the picture more complicated and contradictory, it should be noted that Social Democrats supported the first German republic between 1919 and 1933 more explicitly than most social and political groups: an important point to remember since we know how catastrophic later developments were.

The basic question then is: how could that movement which was, after all, a movement among ordinary people, manage to square these two strategies, these two achievements: push the particular and specific interests of its constituency and contribute to the general good, during the period of nearly a century. The answer is complicated and cannot be given here. It has to take into account processes of working class formation under capitalism and industrialization, certainly. But it also has to take into account the impact of civil society and the role of the 'Bürgertum'. Moreover, it has to take into account that the Social Democratic labour movement had to operate under the regime of an authoritarian state with a level of repression that was limited enough not to crush oppositional movements while being illiberal and antidemocratic enough to present a specific challenge and specific task to the rising labour movement.

So much for placing 19th century labour in a more extended time frame. My second suggestion is very short, more a question. There is a new interest, among European and North American labour historians, in the history of labour outside the advanced industrial countries, in Asia, Latin America and Africa. This can be seen in recent volumes of the *International Review of Social History* or, for example, in the programme of the colloquium organized by the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam on the occasion of its 65th anniversary.[20] This new emphasis squares well with the current interest in global history (a dominant topic in the last World Congress of Historians, held in Oslo in August 2000) and the multi-faceted search for new transnational approaches to history that one observes everywhere in the profession. It certainly responds to intensified experiences of 'globalization' in other spheres of life. It is not yet clear, and it is worthwhile exploring, what this will mean for the history of labour in the West. It will open up new areas, especially comparative studies that look at early periods of labour history in the West in the light of recent developments outside the West. In addition, and perhaps even more importantly, findings on India, South-East Asia and South Africa may make it necessary to rethink our categories; for example, the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press

concept of wage versus subsistence labour, of 'free' and 'unfree' work, the distinction between employed and unemployed, and the notion of class. Processes of rethinking such concepts are on the way already, which this overview should have made clear. They will get an additional push and make some unexpected turns if pursued in the intercultural context of different, but 'entangled' histories.[21]

Finally, perhaps it will be fruitful to move from a history of labour to a history of work. Obviously, interest in labour movements, the 'mission' of the working class and the fate of the workers (*Arbeiter*) is not very dominant any more in the public debates of our societies, but interest in work (*Arbeit*) still is. Will there be a shortage of work in our societies that are so basically founded on work as a structuring principle? Will work as we know it change its character in essence? Will work lose its identity in space and time by being dissolved into partial activities that can be chopped into pieces, and carried out at different locations (with the help of electronic communication) distributed unevenly over a worker's life-span? Questions like these are central presently, at least they are in Germany.

I think they could be used by historians to develop a new history of work. It should be a history with a very broad range, spanning centuries and comparing civilizations with respect to the changing concepts and meanings of work. It should take seriously the impact of industrialization which, for the first time, has universalized work as market-related gainful employment (*Erwerbsarbeit*) and effectively narrowed down both the concept and the practices of work. Such a history could ask what is fundamentally new, if anything, about the present situation and the foreseeable future. In this way, history could cooperate with the other social sciences and enrich present debate.[22] Such a history of work would certainly open up new perspectives for the history of labour. The implications cannot be enlarged on here but it certainly seems to be an idea worth consideration.

Acknowledgements

This is the written version of a short presentation the author gave at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIAS) in October 2000. It addressed scholars from different disciplines. Its introductory character has been maintained. Only a few footnotes have been added. I am grateful to Henk Wesseling for commenting on the manuscript and to Saskia Lepelaar, Petry Kievit-Tyson and Anne Simpson for bringing it into a publishable form.

References

1. Previously appeared: J. Kocka (1990) *Weder Stand noch Klasse. Unterschichten um 1800* (Bonn); Kocka (1990) *Arbeitsverhältnisse und Arbeiterexistenzen. Grundlagen der Klassenbildung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bonn).
2. M. van der Linden (2001) Labour history. In: *The International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences.* New edn (London) forthcoming.
3. Cf. G. Mayer (1912) Die Trennung der proletarischen von der bürgerlichen Demokratie in Deutschland, 1863–70. In: *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus* **2**, pp. 1–67; J. R. Commons (1935) *History of Labor in the United States*, 4 vols (New York). S. Webb and B. Webb (1894) *The History of Trade Unionism* (London).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4. See the essays in E. Hobsbawm (1964) *Labouring Men. Studies in the History of Labour* (London); W. Conze (1954) Vom Pöbel zum Proletariat. In: *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* **41**, pp. 333–364.
5. Developments can be followed by screening the major periodicals in the field: *Le mouvement social*, 1952 ff.; *International Review of Social History*, 1956ff.; *Labor History*, 1960 ff.; *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 1961 ff.
6. D. Montgomery (1981) *Workers' Control in America. Studies in the History of Work, Technology, and Labor Struggles*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, MA); a good German example: H. Schomerus (1977) *Die Arbeiter der Maschinenfabrik Esslingen* (Stuttgart).
7. S. Thernstrom (1964) *Poverty and Progress* (Cambridge, MA); H. Kaelble (1978) *Historische Mobilitätsforschung*, Darmstadt; J. Marczewski (1964) Buts et méthodes de l'histoire quantitative, in *Cahiers V. Pareto* **3**, pp. 125–164; T. K. Rabb (1983) The development of quantification in historical research. In: *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* **13**, pp. 591–601.
8. E. P. Thompson (1963) *The Making of the English Working Class* (Hamondsworth); P. Laslett and R. Wall (eds) (1972) *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge); H. Medick (1976) The proto-industrial family economy. In: *Social History* **1**, pp. 291–315; W. Conze (ed) (1976) *Sozialgeschichte der Familie in der Neuzeit Europas* (Stuttgart); K. Hausen (1977) Historische Familienforschung. In: R. Rürup (ed) (1977) *Historische Sozialwissenschaft*, Göttingen, pp. 58–85; J. Ehmer (1991) *Heiratsverhalten, Sozialstruktur, ökonomischer Wandel. England und Mitteleuropa in der Formationsperiode des Kapitalismus* (Göttingen).
9. H. Volkmann and J. Bergmann (eds) (1984) *Sozialer Protest* (Opladen); D. Geary (1981) *European Labour Protest*, 1848–1939 (London).
10. H. Haumann (ed) (1982) *Arbeiteralltag in Stadt und Land* (Berlin); D. Langewiesche and K. Schönhoven (eds) (1981) *Arbeiter in Deutschland. Studien zur Lebensweise der Arbeiterschaft im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung* (Paderborn); J. Kocka (ed) (1979) *Arbeiterkultur* (= *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* **5**, no.1); A. Lüdtke (1889) *Alltagsgeschichte* (Frankfurt/Main).
11. K. Tenfelde (1987) Die Geschichte der Arbeiter zwischen Strukturgeschichte und Alltagsgeschichte. In: W. Schieder and V. Sellin (eds) *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland*, **4**, pp. 81–107(Göttingen); K. Tenfelde (ed) (1986) *Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung im Vergleich* (Munich).
12. A breakthrough in East German working-class history: H. Zwahr (1978) *Zur Konstituierung des Proletariats als Klasse. Strukturuntersuchung über das Leipziger Proletariat während der industriellen Revolution* (Berlin).
13. J. Kocka (1975) Theoretical approaches to the social and economic history of modern Germany. In: *Journal of Modern History* **47**, pp. 101–79; H.-U. Wehler (1986) Gesellschaftsgeschichte. In: W. Schieder and V. Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland*, **1**, pp. 33–52 (Göttingen).
14. The postmodernist impact in the intellectual traditions of Foucault, Derrida, Hayden White and others has made itself felt in French and particularly in Anglo-American writings on labour history, e.g.: J. Rancière (1981) *La nuit des prolétaires* (Paris); J. Scott (1988) *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York). See the survey: L. Berlanstein (1991) Working with language: the linguistic turn in French labour history. In: *Comparative Studies in Society and History* **33**(2), pp. 426–440. As a collection of articles written in this mood: L. R. Berlanstein (ed) (1993) *Rethinking Labour History*, Urbana, Ill. (with a good introduction by the editor). See note 16 below.
15. I. Katznelson (1994) The 'bourgeois' dimension: a provocation. In: *International*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Labor and Working-Class History, no. 46, pp. 7–32, here 7. (The whole issue is devoted to the reconstruction of labour history.)

16. Cf. already W. H. Sewell (1980) *Work and Revolution in France* (Cambridge); G. Stedman Jones (1984) *Languages of Class* (Cambridge); P. Joyce (1991) *Visions of the People* (Cambridge); Joyce (1994) *Democratic Subjects* (Cambridge). Bryan D. Palmer has been a keen observer and reflected critic of this type of literature. See B. D. Palmer (1990) *Descent into Discourse. The Reification of Language and the Writing of Social History* (Philadelphia), and most recently B. D. Palmer (2000) Fin-de-siècle labour history in Canada and the United States: a case for tradition. Paper presented to a colloquium at the International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, 23–25 November, (forthcoming). As a good survey of recent literature and a reasonable evaluation: D. Geary (2000) Labour history, the 'linguistic turn' and postmodernism. In: *Contemporary European History 9*, pp. 445–462. In German historiography the impact of postmodernism and the 'linguistic turn' has been weak. But now there is a ground-breaking work incorporating much of this postmodernist mood and post-structural sensibility into a broader narrative, a basic reinterpretation of the early Social Democratic labour movement, particularly its political branch: T. Welskopp (2000) *Das Banner der Brüderlichkeit. Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie vom Vormärz bis zum Sozialistengesetz* (Bonn).
17. Cf. S. Rose (1993) Gender and labor history, *International Review of Social History* **38**, Suppl.1, pp. 145–162; K. Canning Gender and the Politics of Class-Formation: Rethinking German Labor History, in: G. Eley (ed) (1996) *Society, Culture and the State in Germany, 1870–1930* (Ann Arbor), pp. 105–141; T. Welskopp (1998) Klasse als Befindlichkeit? Vergleichende Arbeitergeschichte vor der kulturhistorischen Herausforderung, *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* **38**, pp. 301–336.
18. Cf. J. Kocka (1997) New trends in labour movement historiography. A German perspective, *International Review of Social History* **42**, 67–78. J. Kocka and U. Frevert (eds.) (1988) *Bürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert*, 3 vols. (Munich) (abridged ed. Göttingen 1995); there are partial editions in Italian (ed A. M. Banti 1989), English (eds J. Kocka and A. Mitchell 1993), French (eds J. Kocka and H. G. Noiriel, 1996) and Spanish (ed. J. Milàn, 2000). P. Lundgreen (ed) (2000) *Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte des Bürgertums. Eine Bilanz des Bielefelder Sonderforschungsbereichs* (1986–1997) (Göttingen).
19. The relevant literature abounds. I just want to say how much I profited, during my three NIAS months (see Acknowledgements above), from discussions with fellows and colleagues from *Early Modern History*: Wayne te Brake (State University of New York), Nicholas Canny (National University of Ireland, Galway) and Jonathan Israel (Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton).
20. Global Labour History in the 21st Century, 23–25 November 2000.
21. These suggestions are very much in the line suggested by Marcel van der Linden (see Note 2 above). See also his introduction to Jan Kok (ed) (2001) *Rebellious Families* (Oxford and Providence, RI). AGORA, a two-year project of Berlin Wissenschaftskolleg has intensively dealt with the notion of 'entangled histories'. Cf. S. Randeria (1999) Geteilte Geschichte und verwobene Moderne. In: J. Rüsen *et al*. (eds), *Zukunftsentwürfe* (Frankfurt/Main), pp. 87–96. Methodologically, a combination of historical comparison with the history of relations and entanglements is necessary. This approach can also be fruitful for interweaving the histories of Western Europe and Eastern Europe in new ways. Cf. J. Kocka (2000) Zivilgesellschaft als historisches Projekt. Moderne europäische Geschichtsforschung in vergleichender Absicht. In: C. Dipper *et al*. (eds) (2000) *Europäische Sozialgeschichte, Festschrift für Wolfgang Schieder*, (Berlin), pp. 475–484.
22. As an example of cooperation between historians and social scientists: J. Kocka and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press

C. Offe (eds) (2000) *Geschichte und Zukunft der Arbeit* (Frankfurt/Main); W. Conze (1972) Arbeit. In: *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart), pp. 154–215; K. Thomas (ed) (1999) *The Oxford Book of Work* (Oxford).

About the Author

Jürgen Kocka is Professor of History at the Free University of Berlin, President of the Berlin Centre for Social Research (Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung), and a member of the Academia Europaea. He has published on the history of work and labour, the bourgeoisie and large firms, war and bureaucracy in 19th and 20th-century Germany. He is concerned with the comparative history of Europe. His most recent publications include: *Industrial Culture and Bourgeois Society. Business, Labor, and Bureaucracy in Modern Germany* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books 1999).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798701000187 Published online by Cambridge University Press